

In THE UNITED STATES District Court
for THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Quasim Bolling
Plaintiff

v

Gregory Klimaszewski #6531
And
Lawrence Willem's #7394
Defendants

} Case # 14-cv-1574

} THE HONORABLE Judge
John Z Lee
(PRESIDING)

FILED

MAY 14 2018

THOMAS G. BRUTON
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

MOTION FOR FINAL JUDGEMENT
IN CASE #
14-cv-1574

Now comes the (Plaintiff) Pro Se Litigant aka
Petitioner MR. QUASIM BOLLING, And Respectfully
Moves this Honorable Courts and petition a final
Call, Order, or judgement In the above mentioned
Case. Until Docket 231 crossed the plaintiff had
no reason to petition A motion for final judgement.

That's usually the Defendants Approach Due to
A lack of evidence on the plaintiffs Approach to
the Civil Case. . . . However

After the plaintiff RECEIVED notification that SARA MAEY M^EDONALD would be Resigning from the Case of Bolling v. Klimaszewski, He had NO other choice but to file for this particular motion and the Plaintiff MR. Bolling States these facts for Appellate Review.

1. MS Wong was the 1st Attorney Representing the Defendants Klimaszewski And Willems. When She filed for a LEAVE to Withdraw, Ms McDonald Replaced MS Sheri Wong. Then pursuant to MS Wong's withdrawal Ms McDonald withdrew Approximately Nine months ago And Mr Bret Kabanowski Stepped in and that who the Plaintiff Pro-se-plaintiff Mr. Bolling have been attempting to Converse, Communicate, and file Motions with for the last several months will have accurate time upon Appearance for this Motion.

Then upon the Pro-se Plaintiff of wrong doing throughout the Civil and Criminal proceeding MR. BOLLING, Receives A letter from MS McDonald Stating that She is withdrawing from Case # 14-CV-1576, Shortly after MR. Bolling requested a Standing Order Settlement Conference With the Defendants. Justice Lee Denied the Motion Due to the fact that the Plaintiff had failed to converse with MR. Kabanowski NOT MS McDonald. So Upon visiting 30 North LaSalle Suite 900 the plaintiff was made aware that there were more than one Defense Attorney on Case # 14-CV-1576.

In which I the plaintiff found more than Awkward. Then I the plaintiff always understood that officers KLMARCEWSKI #6531 And Lawlene WILLEMS #7394 NEVER ONCE MADE A CLEAR STOP nor IS there any Evidence of NARCOTICS. Upon Mr. Bolling not being aware of the LAW, nor his Civil Rights, as a Citizen of the U.S.A, his own Defense Counsel at the Stage in Criminal proceedings Used his own testimony in Return to win his Criminal Charge. And Collect a sum of \$2500 and a agreement with the State to not be held responsible for the officers unprofessional Improper forceful Conduct. Upon Being made aware Mr. Bolling filed a Complaint even after he regained his freedom against his Defense Attorney in the Criminal Case. He filed with the A.R.D.C of Misconduct and illegal advise from Counsel in which the A.R.D.C are waiting for the outcome of the present Case At hand.

for APPELLATE REVIEW And Supreme Court
As A PRO-SE LITIGANT I FEEL AS FOLLOW

1. THE ARRESTING OFFICERS VIOLATED MY CIVIL RIGHTS BY ME WALKING DOWN THE STREETS IN MY LIVING AREA. USING PHYSICAL FORCE AS A EMERGENCY TAKE DOWN AND MAKING ME ADMIT TO SOMETHING I NEVER HAD I WAS SCARED FOR MY LIFE WHEN THEY ABRUPTLY THREW ME TO THE GROUND

In Civil Action No 1:08-CV-3172 JTC Although this
 is a Case for Plaintiff to Local Rule 56.1 (B) (2) Plaintiff
 respectfully submit the following Responses to Defendants
 undisputed facts 1. Pursuant to L.R. 56.1 (B)(2)(a)(2)(iii)
 Plaintiff dispute Defendant Contention that Since 2005 Secretary
 of State has removed at least 25 individuals from the
 list of eligible voter because they were not US
 Citizens Defendants Exhibit 1 the Petrol record Source
 purports list only 17 individuals as Non Citizens

In Boiling v. Kraszewski the Defendants
 make more than one accusations of recovered Narcotics.
 However the Arrest report States A Specific Amount
 There is no Actual report of the finding of the
 illegal Narcotics Signature E.T.C. Of now the State
 test there case on these Specific finding and petitions
 a Summary Judgment in which the Plaintiff is
 willing agreeing to a Summary Judgment only
 if the proper information was given As in the
 mentioned Case above.

THE Plaintiff States for the record, Although
 the first Case Sited is different a Narcotic Case, And A
 Citizen Case. The results are still the same, If there
 is no Evidence to Challenge then there should be no
 case. As a pro-se litigant. MR. Boiling States
 that in his Civil Case, that the defendants have
 used the proceeds, and protocol for the federal
 Civil and procedure to their advantage.

and have left Case Statute open, for months
in which the defense should have filed for a trial
or jury trial in which to terminate the case.

Now as for MS McDonald's filing for withdrawal
yes the plaintiff wishes to know was that is
the Rms of Case # 14-cv-1574. There would
of been some kind of violations due to the
fact that the plaintiff has been associating w/
a phantom Attorney, which is another fault in
the judicial system against pro -Se litigants.

The plaintiff is petitioning motion to dismiss with
prejudice due to the fact that the defendants have
been using their professionalism, as Attorneys of
law to Embarrass or Intimidate further use to
stop a United State Citizens to enforce the Constitution
of the United States of America for Quasim Boling

Rule 4.3. Dealing with Unrepresented Person

In dealing on behalf of a Client with a person who
is not represented by Counsel, a Lawyer Shall not State or imply
that the Lawyer is Disinterested. When the Lawyer
Knows or reasonably Should Know that the unrepresented person
misunderstands the Lawyers role in the matter, the Lawyer
Shall not give legal advice to an unrepresented person
other than the advice to Secure Counsel if the Lawyer
Knows or reasonably Should Know that the interest

However, for the last several months the plaintiff Quasim Bolling has been visiting petitioning and filing motions to MR. BRET KABANOWSKI, to the fact that Ms McDonald had withdrawn her position as the Defendants Counsel back in the year 2017, Right after Ms Iker Wong withdrew as Attorney to the Defendants LACON Khorastewski and Lawrence Wille both employed by the City of Chicago Police Depa

Now the plaintiff Quasim Bolling has worked diligently with the Appropriate Attorney for the Defense As it was brought down to him from the District Courts. The Plaintiff says that all of his Information and work have been destroyed or lost due to the Changes, Withdrawals and motions to leave by the Defendants Representation. The Plaintiff voice the Honorable Courts only for Appellant Review to Investigate further of the Defendants Accusations of Illegal doings. It is plan to visualize that the Plaintiff Civil Rights has been violated all through the Criminal proceeding as well as his Civil Rights. In the Plaintiff Criminal proceeding in which was won only to the position of Client Attorney Relationship. In which the Plaintiff was told by his hired Attorney to Admit to something that was not even found for his freedom in which was sold at \$25,000 to walk from the Penal Institution.

And Now At this point for APPELLATE
REVIEW the plaintiff IS ASKING AT this LEVEL
A THOROUGH REVIEW FROM THE HONORABLE JUDGE
JOHN Z. LEE And Set for A STANDING ORDER
SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE which was Suggested by
ATTORNEY MR. BRET KABANCIANSKI WHO WAS SAID TO
BE the DEFENSE REPRESENTATION. MS MARY McDONALD
HAS WITHDRAWN from CASE # 14-CV-1574. In which there
WERE ANY MOTIONS OR PETITIONS FILED to HER

In which this should be illegal for the States
ATTORNEY to file a withdrawal if she NEVER
WAS ON THE CASE for the PRO-SE litigant. IT WAS
done to EXTEND time for MR KABANCIANSKI to file
his final motion the plaintiff request A full Review
BEFORE STATING another Constitutional Violation OR
Explain the previous motion.

of such a person are or have a reasonable
possibility of being in conflict with the interest of the
Client

This is in fact what the defense have been
doing to the Plaintiff Rose S. H. gant & Qasim Boling
We would further go into a second Chapter
of this motion for final judgement due to the
fact that appearance is necessary thank you for your
cooperation and may the Court find justice and favor
in the plaintiff Qasim Boling for the
unfairness in this Civil procedure

Qasim Boling
Respectfully Submitted

Qasim Boling

5-14-18